REMARKS

Claims 1 – 19 are pending in the Patent Application.

Claims 1 –5, 7 – 15, and 17 – 19 are rejected.

Claims 6 and 16 are objected to.

Claims 1 – 5, 7 –15, and 17 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

In particular, Examiner states that:

(i)   in Claims 1 and 11, it is not clear how the token reported to the graphical programming environment is used;

(ii)   in Claims 5 and 15, it is not clear what is the use of the comparison result; and

(iii)   in Claims 9 and 19, "said comparison" lack antecedent basis.

Applicant has attempted to address the above 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, rejections as follows:

In Claims 1 and 11, Applicant has amended the language to indicate how the token reported to the graphical programming environment is used, as follows: "said digital logic reporting said one or more tokens at one of said function units to a graphical programming environment *to generate an error message*." (Emphasis added.) Applicant believes that this addresses Examiner's concern in reciting how the token reported to the graphical programming environment is used. No new matter has been added. (See Specification, page 3, lines 7 – 9.)

For the feature previously recited in Claim 5, which has been incorporated by this Amendment into independent Claim 1 (as above-described), Applicant has amended the language to indicate what the use of the comparison result is, as follows: "wherein said programming environment compares said one or more tokens arriving from said digital logic with store values for said one or more tokens *to generate said error message.*" (Emphasis added.) Applicant believes that this addresses Examiner's concern in reciting language to indicate what the use of the comparison result is. No new matter has been added. (See Specification, page 3, lines 7 – 9.) Applicant has similarly dealt with the language of previously recited Claim 15, which feature has been incorporated by this Amendment into independent Claim 11.

Claims 9 and 19 have been canceled by this Amendment rendering moot the lack of antecedent basis for "said comparison".

Examiner states that Claims 6 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended Claim 6 by incorporating the features of Claim 6 into independent Claim 1; and also by including the features of intervening dependent Claims 2, 4, and 5. Consequently, Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Claims 3, 7, 8, and 10 which each, respectively, depend (either directly or indirectly) upon allowable independent Claim 1 and each, respectively, recites additional features thereto, are also in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended Claim 16 by incorporating the features of Claim 16 into independent Claim 11; and also by including the features of intervening dependent Claims 12, 14, and 15. Therefore, Claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Moreover, Claims 13, 17, and 18 which each, respectively, depend (either directly or indirectly)

upon allowable independent Claim 11 and each, respectively, recites additional features thereto, are also in condition for allowance.

Applicants request that Examiner duly consider the amendments to the claims as set forth therein.

Applicants request that Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18, and be allowed and that the case pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 30,021

Leonard A. Alkov, Attorney for Applicants

Tel. No. 310.647.2577
Fax No. 310.647.2616

Raytheon Company
P.O. Box 902 (E4/N119)
El Segundo, CA 90245-0902